DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 046 016 CG 006 079

AUTHOR Heaps, Richard A.; And Others
TITLE Student Awareness of the University of Utah Counseling Center. Research Report 25.; Client's Counseling Evaluation Inventory Ratings of Counselors and Academic Recovery Through Structured Group Counseling. Research Report 23.
INSTITUTION Utah Univ., Salt Lake City.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 35p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS College Students, *Counseling Centers, *Counseling Effectiveness, *Counselor Characteristics, Counselor Evaluation, Counselor Performance, *Student Needs, Student Personnel Programs, *Student Personnel Services

ABSTRACT

Paper one discusses client ratings of counselors based on the Counseling Evaluation Inventory, and academic recovery through structured group counseling. Conclusions suggest that counseling success varies as a function of counselor comfort, and that counselors tend to become more comfortable with experience. Consequently, experienced counselors tend to be more effective to the extent that their experience is accompanied by perceived comfort with their involvement in a particular counseling context. The second paper presents a study designed to investigate awareness of the Counseling Center, as perceived by University of Utah students. It was found that about one quarter of the student sample were totally unfamiliar with the Center, and that whether students had been to and/or heard of the Center was related to their perception of the Center's service function. Study results strongly point to the need for greater student awareness of the Center's function. (Author/KJ)

ED046016 CG 006 079

STUDENT AWARENESS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH COUNSELING CENTER

Karl Rickabaugh and Richard A. Heaps

Research Report No. 25
University of Utah Counseling Center, 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EDO 46016

"Where were we supposed to learn about it and its functions?
After three quarters of 'active' participation on campus I
have yet to come across the Counseling Center."

...a student

STUDENT AWARENESS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH COUNSELING CENTER

Karl Rickabaugh and Richard A. Heaps

This study was designed to investigate University of Utah students' awareness of their Counseling Center. It was stimulated by the realization that (a) the services offered by the Counseling Center can only benefit the University's students to the degree that they are used; and (b) these services can only be used to the extent that they are known to and recognized by the students. Consequently, an attempt was made to survey student awareness of the Center and its services.

It was assumed that to the degree students were found to be unaware of the Counseling Center there would be a need for more effective methods of publicizing the Center and its services. Anticipating this potential exigency, an attempt was also made to discover what students would most like to know about their Counseling Center. It was felt that this information would assist in the development of improved information-providing programs designed to acquaint students with available counseling services.

Method

A sample of 808 University of Utah students was obtained by soliciting the cooperation of students attending 31 different university classes representing 20 course offerings in 10 different subject areas. The sample was stratified with respect to academic class, college, and sex. The figures presented in Table 1 suggest that the sample used may be considered

TABLE 1

Numerical Description of the Sample and Daytime Enrollment Populations by Academic Class, College, and Sex

	DAYTIME ENROLLMENT (N=11554)		SAMPLE (N=808)	
	N	%	N	%
Academic Class				
Freshmen	3189	27.6	215	26.6
Sophomores	2358	20.4	191	23.6
Juniors	1895	16.4	184	22.8
Seniors	2656	23.0	119	14.7
Graduates[a]	1456	12.6	99	12.3
College				
Business	1058	9.2	129	16.0
Education	1640	14.2	157	19.4
Engineering	894	7.7	92	11.4
Fine Arts	703	6.1	80	9.9
Letters & Science	5109	44.2	228	28.2
Other[b]	694	6.0	23	2.8
Graduate School[c]	1456	12.6	99	12.3
Sex				
Males	7439	64.4	494	61.1
Females	4115	35.6	314	38.9

Note.--The Spring Quarter, 1967 daytime enrollment figures used do not include the colleges of Medicine and Law, the Graduate School of Social Work, General Studies and undergraduate non-matriculated students, and visitors because of the small number of students in each of the special groups.

[a]Includes the graduate school.

[b]Mines and mineral industry, nursing, and pharmacy.

[c]Includes graduates.

representative of the total daytime student population.

A two-page Counseling Center Research Project Questionnaire (see Appendix) was administered to the students in their classes during the final week of the spring quarter, 1967. Administration time was approximately 15 minutes. The questionnaire consisted of a section dealing with vital statistics -- i.e., academic class, college, sex, etc. -- and 12 items designed to assess student awareness of the Counseling Center and its service functions. Not all of the information obtained was used in the present study.

Descriptive statistical information was provided for 24 different student subgroups by dividing the sample on the basis of academic class, college, residence, marital status, sex, age, and whether students had been to and/or heard of the Counseling Center.

Results and Discussion

When asked if they had heard of the Counseling Center nearly one-quarter (23.3%) of the total student sample indicated they were not aware of the Center's existence. More importantly, nearly one-third (30.8%) of the students reporting they had never been to the Center had not heard of the Center. Given such a sizeable proportion of the studentbody being unaware of the Counseling Center, it seems reasonable to conclude that the Center cannot be optimally fulfilling its service function. The mere existence of Counseling services does not ensure their use by students who feel a need for the services which are, in fact, available to them.

Such students must first be aware of those services. It is entirely possible that the degree of student unawareness revealed by this study is at least partly a function of the Center's peripheral and "concealed" location. Nevertheless, this finding suggests a need for more effective methods of acquainting students with the Center and its available services.

When the data in Table 2 were examined by student subgroups, differences in awareness were apparent. For example, a larger percentage of engineering (43.5%), sophomore (35.1%), fine arts (32.5%), freshmen (27.0%), dormitory (27.4%) students, and students under 21 years (27.7%) had not heard of the Counseling Center than other subgroups of students. Curiously, a larger percentage of students living off-campus were aware of the Center's existence than students living in on-campus dormitories.

The number and percentage of students in University subgroups who had/had not been to the Counseling Center one or more times is presented in Table 3. Approximately one-quarter (24.4%) of the student sample had visited the Counseling Center at least once. The fact that nearly one-third (31.5%) of the students reporting they had heard of the Counseling Center had been to the Center one or more times tends to emphasize the need for publicizing the Center, and suggests that there are students who would come for counseling if they were aware of the existing services.

Again, subgroup differences were evident. A larger percentage of students living off-campus (25.4%) had been to the Counseling Center one or more times than had students living in on-campus dormitories (19.8%). A greater percentage of male students (27.2%) had been to the Counseling

TABLE 2

Number and Percentage of Students in University Subgroups Who Have/Have Not Heard of the Counseling Center (CC)

Subgroup	Have Heard		Have Not Heard	
	N	%	N	%
Academic Class				
Freshmen	155	72.1	60	27.9
Sophomores	124	64.9	67	35.1
Juniors	157	85.3	27	14.7
Seniors	99	83.2	20	16.8
Graduates[a]	85	85.9	14	14.1
College				
Business	100	77.5	29	22.5
Education	132	84.1	25	15.9
Engineering	52	56.5	40	43.5
Fine Arts	54	67.5	26	32.5
Letters & Science	183	80.0	45	19.7
Other[b]	14	60.9	9	39.1
Graduate School[c]	85	85.9	14	14.1
Residence				
Dormitory	77	72.6	29	27.4
Fraternity & Soroity	23	82.1	5	17.9
Off-campus	520	77.2	154	22.8
Marital Status				
Single	455	75.5	148	24.5
Married	164	80.4	40	19.6
Sex				
Males	370	75.1	123	24.9
Females	249	79.3	65	20.7
Age				
Under 21	269	72.3	103	27.7
21-24	234	81.5	53	18.5
25+	116	78.9	31	21.1
Students Who Have Not Been to CC	423	69.2	188	30.8
Total Sample	620	76.7	188	23.3

[a]Includes the graduate school.
[b]Mines and mineral industry, nursing, and pharmacy.
[c]Includes graduates.

TABLE 3

Number and Percentage of Students in University Subgroups Who Have/Have Not Been to the Counseling Center (CC)

	Have Been[a]		Have Not Been	
	N	%	N	%
Academic Class				
Freshmen	44	20.5	171	79.5
Sophomores	40	20.9	151	79.1
Juniors	58	31.5	126	68.5
Seniors	28	23.5	91	76.5
Graduates[b]	26	26.3	73	73.7
College				
Business	36	27.9	93	72.1
Education	37	23.6	120	76.4
Engineering	21	22.8	71	77.2
Fine Arts	7	8.8	73	91.2
Letters & Science	65	28.5	163	71.5
Other[c]	4	17.4	19	82.6
Graduate School[d]	26	26.3	73	73.7
Residence				
Dormitory	21	19.8	85	80.2
Fraternity & Sorority	5	17.9	23	82.1
Off-campus	171	25.4	503	74.6
Marital Status				
Single	150	24.8	453	75.1
Married	47	23.1	157	77.0
Sex				
Male	134	27.2	359	72.8
Female	61	19.5	253	80.6
Age				
Under 21	82	22.0	290	78.0
21-24	82	28.6	205	71.4
25+	33	22.4	114	77.6
Students Who Have Heard of CC	195	31.6	423	68.4
Total Sample	197	24.4	611	75.6

[a]One or more visits.
[b]Includes the graduate school.
[c]Mines and mineral industry, nursing, and pharmacy.
[d]Includes graduates.

Center one or more times than had female students (19.5%), a finding consistent with the trend reported in the University of Utah Counseling Center Annual Report 1967-68. An obviously smaller percentage of fine arts students (8.8%) had visited the Counseling Center than had any other subgroup of students studied.

When asked to select the type of problem most commonly presented by students who go to the Counseling Center (Table 4), students saw the Center primarily as a place where problems of vocational choice (44.1%) and college routine (43.4%) were presented for discussion with counselors. Only one-eighth (12.6%) of the student sample felt that problems of adjustment to self and others were most commonly presented for discussion with counselors. It is interesting to note that these figures closely parallel the percent of problem types actually discussed with counselors at the Center (University of Utah Counseling Center Annual Report 1967-68). However, one wonders if these figures may not also reflect a general student viewpoint that personal-social problems are inappropriate for discussion at the Counseling Center. If valid, this would underline the importance of acquainting students with the full range of services which counselors at the Center are trained to provide.

As shown in Table 4 a relationship was found to exist between academic class and the type of problem perceived as the one most commonly presented by students who go to the Counseling Center -- i.e., problems of vocational choice tended to be viewed as more commonly presented and problems of college routine less commonly presented from the freshman to the senior.

TABLE 4

Number and Percentage of Students in University Subgroups Selecting One of Three Types of Problems as Being Most Commonly Presented By Students Who Go to the Counseling Center (CC)

Subgroup	Vocational Choice		College Routine		Adjustment to Self & Others	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Academic Class						
Freshmen	77	35.8	112	52.1	26	12.1
Sophomores	84	44.0	86	45.1	21	11.0
Juniors	94	51.1	64	34.8	26	14.2
Seniors	57	47.9	44	37.0	18	15.1
Graduates	44	44.4	44	44.4	11	11.4
College						
Business	63	48.8	55	42.7	11	8.4
Education	75	47.8	56	35.6	26	16.6
Engineering	40	43.5	41	44.5	11	12.0
Fine Arts	20	25.0	45	56.2	15	18.8
Letters & Science	108	47.4	95	41.7	25	10.9
Other	6	26.1	14	60.8	3	13.0
Graduate School	44	44.4	44	44.4	11	11.2
Residence						
Dormitory	42	39.6	50	47.2	14	13.2
Fraternity & Sorority	16	57.1	7	25.0	5	17.9
Off-campus	298	44.3	293	43.5	83	12.3
Marital Status						
Single	265	44.0	264	43.8	74	12.2
Married	91	44.6	86	42.2	27	13.3
Sex						
Male	219	44.4	220	44.7	54	11.0
Female	136	43.3	130	41.4	48	15.3
Age						
Under 21	159	42.7	172	46.3	41	11.1
21-24	135	47.1	110	38.3	42	14.7
25+	61	41.5	67	45.6	19	12.9
Students Who Have						
Heard of CC	284	45.7	255	41.3	81	13.1
Not Heard of CC	174	39.4	93	49.4	21	11.2
Students Who Have						
Been to CC	100	50.8	83	42.3	14	7.1
Not Been to CC	258	42.3	266	43.5	87	14.2
Total Sample	356	44.1	350	43.4	102	12.6

[a]Includes the graduate school.
[b]Mines and mineral industry, nursing, and pharmacy.
[c]Includes graduates.

year. This makes intuitive sense and seems to fit the reality demands placed on students. Freshmen are more apt to be concerned with making routine adjustments to a new scholastic atmosphere, but the further students progress toward completion of their educational experience the more pressing the need becomes to make a definite career choice.

It was found that whether students had been to and/or heard of the Counseling Center was related to their perception of the Center's service function. That is: (a) students who had not heard of the Counseling Center tended to feel that problems of college routine were most frequently presented for discussion with counselors; whereas, students who had heard of the Center tended to feel that problems of vocational choice were most frequently presented; (b) students who had been to the Counseling Center one or more times felt that problems of vocational choice were more frequently presented for discussion with counselors and that problems of adjustment to self and others were less frequently presented for discussion than students who had never been to the Counseling Center.

It is apparent that student perceptions and, consequently, use of the Counseling Center is influenced by their awareness and understanding of the Center. The major implication of this study, a need for greater student awareness of the Center's service functions, is emphasized by the data presented in Table 5. When students were asked what they would most like to know about the Counseling Center the overwhelming request (58.6% of the questions asked) was for information about the purpose and/or services provided by the Center. Students wanted to know: "Just exactly

TABLE 5

What University Students Would Most Like to Know About the Counseling Center (CC)

Subgroup	Purpose &/or Services		Mechanics		Location		Counseling Effectiveness		Publicity		Tests		Counselor Qualifications		Misc.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Academic Class																
Freshmen	82	54.3	27	17.9	18	11.9	8	5.3	5	3.3	4	2.6	2	1.3	5	3.3
Sophomores	90	62.1	17	11.7	13	9.0	7	4.8	5	3.4	3	2.1	1	0.7	9	6.2
Juniors	74	62.2	13	10.9	10	8.4	6	5.0	7	5.9	5	4.2	1	0.8	3	2.5
Seniors	44	63.8	4	5.8	5	7.2	5	7.2	4	5.8	1	1.4	1	1.4	5	7.2
Graduates[a]	23	46.0	5	10.0	4	8.0	6	12.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	2	4.0	8	16.0
College																
Business	42	54.5	9	11.7	9	11.7	4	5.2	4	5.2	2	2.6	1	1.3	6	7.8
Education	75	65.2	13	11.3	6	5.2	6	5.2	9	7.8	2	1.7	2	1.7	2	1.7
Engineering	41	68.3	5	8.3	9	15.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	2	3.3	0	0.0	2	3.3
Fine Arts	34	60.7	6	10.7	6	10.7	2	3.6	4	7.2	1	1.8	1	1.8	2	3.6
Letters & Science	89	55.3	28	17.4	14	8.7	12	7.5	5	3.1	6	3.7	1	0.6	6	3.7
Others[b]	11	78.6	0	0.0	2	14.2	1	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Grad. School[c]	23	46.0	5	10.0	4	8.0	6	12.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	2	4.0	8	16.0
Residence																
Dormitory	40	48.8	24	29.3	5	6.1	5	6.1	4	4.9	1	1.2	1	1.2	2	2.4
Fraternity & Sorority	16	66.7	3	12.5	1	4.2	1	4.2	2	8.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.2
Off-campus	257	58.7	49	11.2	44	10.0	26	5.9	16	3.7	13	3.0	6	1.4	27	6.2
Marital Status																
Single	234	57.4	53	13.0	41	10.0	24	5.9	15	3.7	12	2.9	5	1.2	24	5.9
Married	78	62.4	13	10.4	9	7.2	8	6.4	7	5.6	2	1.6	2	1.6	6	4.8

Note.--416 students (51.5% of the total sample) asked 534 questions. The values presented in this table represent the number of questions asked, not the number of students asking questions.

[a]Includes graduate school.

[b]Mines and mineral industry, nursing, and pharmacy.

[c]Includes graduates.

TABLE 5 (Continued)

What University Students Would Most Like to Know About the Counseling Center (CC)

Subgroup	Purpose &/or Services		Mechanics		Location		Counseling Effectiveness		Publicity		Tests		Counselor Qualifications		Misc.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Sex																
Male	184	60.7	34	11.2	28	9.2	22	7.3	6	2.0	10	3.3	2	0.7	17	5.6
Female	129	55.8	32	13.9	22	9.5	10	4.3	16	6.9	4	1.7	5	2.2	13	5.6
Age																
Under 21	154	56.6	41	15.1	34	12.5	14	5.1	11	4.0	8	2.9	3	1.1	7	2.6
21-24	107	61.1	15	8.6	12	6.9	9	5.1	7	4.0	5	2.9	3	1.7	17	9.7
25+	50	58.8	10	11.8	4	4.7	9	10.6	4	4.7	1	1.2	1	1.2	6	7.1
Students Who Have																
Heard of CC	195	55.2	44	12.5	24	6.8	26	7.4	16	4.5	14	4.0	7	2.0	27	7.6
Not Heard of CC	117	65.4	21	11.7	26	14.5	6	3.4	6	3.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.7
Students Who Have																
Been to CC	30	46.2	7	10.8	0	0.0	6	9.2	4	6.2	6	9.2	0	0.0	12	18.4
Not Been to CC	283	60.9	59	12.7	49	10.5	25	5.4	18	3.9	7	1.5	6	1.3	18	3.9
Total Sample	313	58.6	66	12.4	50	9.4	32	6.0	22	4.1	14	2.6	7	1.3	30	5.6

Note.--416 students (51.5%) of the total sample) asked 534 questions. The values presented in this table represent the number of questions asked, not the number of students asking questions.

what counseling services are offered?" "What kinds of problems will they entertain?" "How can it help me as a student?" "What does the Counseling Center have to offer?" etc. Other information requested by students included mechanics (e.g., "How do you set up an appointment?"), location (e.g., "Where is it?"), counseling effectiveness (e.g., "Does it really help students?"), tests (e.g., "What specific types of tests are available, and what can they tell me?"), and publicity (e.g., "Why isn't more information about the Counseling Center circulated?").

It is hoped that the findings reported and discussed in this study have created a sense of urgency. The writers suspect that these results can be generalized to include the present student population. If so, the task ahead seems clear....

Summary of Findings

1. Nearly one-quarter (23.3%) of the student sample had not heard of the University's Counseling Center.

2. Nearly one-third (30.8%) of the students reporting they had never been to the Counseling Center had not heard of the Center.

3. Differences in student awareness of the Counseling Center were evident -- i.e., a larger percentage of engineering (43.5%), sophomore (35.1%), fine arts (32.5%), freshman (27.9%), dormitory (27.4%) students, and students under 21 years (27.7%) had not heard of the Counseling Center than other subgroups of students.

4. Approximately one-quarter (24.4%) of the student sample had been

to the University's Counseling Center one or more times.

5. Nearly one-third (31.5%) of the students reporting they had heard of the Counseling Center had been to the Center one or more times.

6. A larger percentage of students living off-campus (25.4%) had been to the Counseling Center one or more times than had students living in on-campus dormitories (19.8%).

7. A greater percentage of male students (27.2%) had been to the Counseling Center one or more times than had female students (19.5%).

8. A smaller percentage of fine arts students (8.8%) had been to the Counseling Center one or more times than had any other subgroup of students studied.

9. The Counseling Center was seen by most students as a place where problems of vocational choice (44.1%) and college routine (43.4%) were presented for discussion with counselors.

10. One-eighth (12.6%) of the student sample felt that problems of adjustment to self and others were most commonly presented for discussion with counselors.

11. There was a relationship between academic class and the type of problem perceived as the one most commonly presented by students who go to the Counseling Center -- i.e., problems of vocational choice tended to be viewed as more commonly presented and problems of college routine less commonly presented from the freshman to the senior year.

12. Students who had not heard of the Counseling Center tended to feel that problems of college routine were most frequently presented for

discussion with counselors; whereas, students who had heard of the Center tended to feel that problems of vocational choice were most frequently presented.

13. Students who had been to the Counseling Center one or more times felt that problems of vocational choice were more frequently presented for discussion with counselors and that problems of adjustment to self and others were less frequently presented for discussion than students who had never been to the Counseling Center.

14. Students, when asked what they would most like to know about the Counseling Center, requested information regarding the purpose of and/or services offered by the Center more frequently than any other type of information.

APPENDIX

COUNSELING CENTER RESEARCH PROJECT QUESTIONNAIRE
PART I

Please answer the following questions. If you do not know, try to make an estimate. No individual information will be identified in the research report. Your cooperation is sincerely appreciated.

Student Number _____ Age _____ Sex_____ Marital Status _____
Phone Number _____ Residence: Dormitory.....____
Fraternity/Sorority...____
Off-campus.....____

College: Business.....____
Education.....____
Engineering.....____
Fine Arts.....____
Letters & Science...____
Other:_____

Class: Freshman.....____
Sophomore.....____
Junior.....____
Senior.....____
Graduate.....____

1. Have you heard of the Counseling Center? Yes_____ No _____
2. Where is the Counseling Center located? (Indicate specific location if possible, i.e., floor, room etc.)
   a. Annex,_____
   b. Math Building,_____
   c. Orson Spencer Hall,_____
   d. Park Building,_____
   e. Union Building,_____
3. Most students who go to the Counseling Center are:
   a. self-referred
   b. referred by some faculty member
   c. referred by the Admissions Office
   d. referred by teh Scholastic Standards Committee
   e. referred by other students
4. The Counseling Center services are primarily focused on the:
   a. entering freshman
   b. seriously maladjusted student
   c. student with scholastic difficulties
   d. relatively normal student
   e. student without an academic major
5. What is the primary function of the Counseling Center?
   a. the giving of expert advice
   b. the administration and interpretation of tests
   c. individual counseling with students
   d. conducting group sessions with students
   e. the dissemination of information
6. On the average, the Counseling Center conducts about_____interviews with students each month?
   a. 75
   b. 150
   c. 300
   d. 600
   e. 1200

7. How many counselors work at the Counseling Center?
   a. less than 5
   b. 5-10
   c. 15-20
   d. 25-30
   e. more than 30

8. What is the educational background of most Counseling Center counselors?
   a. doctorate degree
   b. master's degree (M.A. or M.S.)
   c. bachelor's degree (B.A. or B.S.)
   d. no degree

9. Place the number 1 to the left of the type of problem which is presented most commonly by students who go to the Counseling Center. Indicate with a 2 and 3 the next most common problem areas.
   _____ Adjustment to Self and Others - personal problems
   _____ College Routine - study difficulties, academic matters
   _____ Vocational Choice - educational-vocational problem

10. How many times have you gone to the Counseling Center?
    never_____ once_____ twice_____ 3 or more times_____

11. If so (see #10 above), what type of problem did you present?
    a. Adjustment to Self and Others - personal problem
    b. College Routine - study difficulty; academic problem
    c. Vocational Choice - educational-vocational problem

12. What would you most like to know about the Counseling Center?

EDO 46016 CG 006 079

CLIENTS' COUNSELING EVALUATION INVENTORY RATINGS OF COUNSELORS AND ACADEMIC RECOVERY THROUGH STRUCTURED GROUP COUNSELING

Richard A. Heaps, Karl Rickabaugh, and Robert E. Finley

Research Report No. 23
University of Utah Counseling Center, 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CLIENTS' COUNSELING EVALUATION INVENTORY RATINGS OF COUNSELORS AND ACADEMIC RECOVERY THROUGH STRUCTURED GROUP COUNSELING

On the basis of armchair reasoning some counselors are generally considered to be more effective than others in the counseling tasks they undertake. Such speculations, lacking objective support, are maintained on the basis of rationality. Therefore, subjective judgments of counseling effectiveness, while often supported by the nebulous concept of consensual validity, do not satisfy the need for empirical evaluation of counseling success.

Linden, Stone, and Shertzer (1965) approached this problem by developing the Counseling Evaluation Inventory (CEI) which was designed to assess counseling effectiveness based on client estimates of Counseling Climate, Counselor Comfort, and Client Satisfaction. A number of studies have been reported using this inventory. Client ratings of counselors have been found to be related to counselor candidates' practicum grades and supervisor ratings of counselor effectiveness (Brown & Cannaday, 1969; Johnson, Shertzer, Linden, & Stone, 1967; Linden, Stone, & Shertzer, 1965), and level of counselor experience (Ivey, Miller, & Gabbert, 1968; Reed, 1969). However, most of these studies have not adequately dealt with the problem of <u>actual</u> counseling effectiveness, due to a lack of sufficient criterion information and an inadequate understanding of related causal factors. Useful evaluations of counseling effectiveness require a measurable criterion based on the goals of the counseling activity. The

effective ingredients of the counseling process should also be accounted for by identifiable factors.

This study attempted to control the criterion problem by utilizing change in grade-point average as a definitive outcome measure, and employed the CEI in an attempt to isolate variables related to objectively measured counseling effectiveness.

It was hypothesized that group counselors who were found to be more effective in promoting academic recovery would be rated higher on the CEI subtests than low-effective group counselors. Three specific null hypotheses were stated:

1. There is no significant difference between client ratings of counseling climate for counselors classified operationally into high- and low-effective groups.
2. There is no significant difference between client ratings of counselor comfort for counselors classified operationally into high- and low-effective groups.
3. There is no significant difference between client ratings of client satisfaction for counselors classified operationally into high- and low-effective groups.

Method

Subjects

The Ss were 40 male and 27 female probationary university students assigned to eight Efficient Study Program (ESP) counseling groups according to the times they were free to attend. Their cumulative pre-counseling GPA's ranged from .54 to 1.99 with a mean of 1.54.[1] The mean pre-counseling GPA's for the eight counseling groups were not significantly different; therefore, randomization of Ss was assumed.

Treatment Procedure

Each ESP counseling group, ranging from 6 to 12 members, met twice weekly for seven weeks. The sessions lasted approximately one hour. The median number of client contacts for the eight groups combined was 11 hours.

Six doctoral students employed as counseling psychology interns at the University of Utah Counseling Center served as the ESP group leaders. Each group leader had a minimum of one year of experience with a variety of individual and group counseling activities.

The program's primary objective was to help students improve their GPA. The ESP groups were structured to deal with issues of educational-vocational involvement, study method, and personal-social adjustment. This prescriptive approach was implimented with an integrated didactic and experiential counseling method (Rickabaugh & Pappas, 1969).

---

[1]Letter grades at the University of Utah correspond to the following quantitative grade-point equivalents: A=4.00, B=3.00, C+=2.40, C=2.00, C-=1.60, D=1.00, E=0.00.

Counseling Outcome

A pre-post change score obtained by taking the difference per subject between his pre-counseling cumulative GPA and his GPA earned the quarter of counseling (i.e., post-counseling GPA) was used to assess the effect of the counseling experience. Pre-counseling cumulative GPA (vs. previous quarter's GPA) was used to provide the most rigorous and representative measure of each student's level of functioning prior to placement in a counseling group.

The six counselors were divided into two groups on the basis of client outcome. The three counselors with the largest mean difference between clients' pre- and post-counseling GPA's (.57) were operationally defined as high-effective; the three counselors with the smallest mean GPA difference (.18) were defined as low-effective. The difference between the high- and low-effective counselors was found to be significant ($t=2.52$, $p < .02$).

Client Perceptions

Client perceptions were obtained using the Counseling Evaluation Inventory (CEI) subtests measuring counseling climate, counselor comfort, and client satisfaction (Linden, Stone, & Shertzer, 1965). The CEI was scored using the factor scoring weights reported by Linden, Stone, and Shertzer (1965). See Appendix A for a copy of the inventory. Following completion of the treatment program the CEI, accompanied by a cover letter (Appendix C), was mailed to each S. The letter asked the S to complete the inventory, indicating how he felt about his counselor as an ESP group leader. An 80 per cent return was obtained, ensuring a representative sample.

Client perceptions of the high- and low-effective counselors on the three CEI subtests were contrasted by means of *t* tests.

Results and Discussion

Table 1 presents comparisons between the mean CEI subtest ratings for the high- and low-effective counseling groups.[2] An analysis of the data supported hypotheses one and three, but hypothesis two was rejected. That is, based on the data presented in this study, there is support for the belief that the comfort of the counselor as it is perceived by the counselee in a group setting is significantly related to the client's academic improvement. The overall counseling climate, as perceived by the client, and the client's estimate of his satisfaction, as measured by the CEI, were not found to be significantly related to academic improvement.

A previous study (Rickabaugh, Heaps, & Fuhriman, 1969) demonstrated that differences in counselor effectiveness in a counseling program designed to effect academic recovery were related to the client-perceived counselor qualities of optimism and responsibility. It was proposed that the more effective counselors felt more confident and adequate within the context of the structured group counseling approach employed. Johnson, Shertzer, Linden, and Stone (1967) found that counselors judged to be effective with counselees who sought educational-vocational counseling were characterized as confident, affable, and accepting. According to Johnson et al. (1967),

---

[2]A table of means and standard deviations for the six individual counselors is presented in Appendix B.

TABLE 1

Counseling Evaluation Inventory (CEI) Means, Standard Deviations, and t Values for Two Groups of Counselors

	High-Effective		Low-Effective			
CEI Factors	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Diff.	t
Counseling Climate	13.25	4.04	11.74	3.94	1.51	1.44
Counselor Comfort	7.89	3.39	4.91	3.27	2.98	3.39*
Client Satisfaction	8.43	3.26	7.17	3.11	1.26	1.52
Total	29.57	8.06	23.83	8.62	5.74	2.66*

Note.--The three high-effective counselors were rated by 44 clients; three low-effective counselors were rated by 23 clients.

*$p < .01$.

the effective counselors seemed to be "satisfied with themselves and their surroundings." These studies, along with the present findings, strongly suggest that effective counselors are likely to be involved in a type of therapeutic endeavor in which they feel confident and satisfied with their ability as change agents -- i.e., they feel comfortable in that counseling context. In other words, counseling effectiveness may be largely a function of counselor comfort.

The format of the CEI implies that both counseling climate and client satisfaction are also intrinsically relevant aspects of client evaluations, and consequently, effectiveness. Such an implication was not supported by this study. In relation to the counseling climate variable two possible explanations are offered. First, it may be that the counselor-counselee relationship in the group setting coupled with the definitive goal of academic improvement would put less emphasis on the aspects associated with counseling climate (i.e., acceptance, understanding, listening, etc.). Second, it seems logical that the relationship variables associated with counseling climate may have differential importance to counselees and may be more related to perceptual expectations than to the outcome criterion utilized.

The lack of correspondence between client satisfaction and counseling effectiveness, in this study, may be a function of the treatment method employed. In accordance with research findings regarding effective academic group counseling (Bednar & Weinberg, 1970; Gilbreath, 1967), the prescriptive ESP approach was structured independent of students' expectations --

i.e., students were typically not free to discuss topics of their choice. It may be, therefore, that the help expectations of many students were disconfirmed. This is consistent with the findings of Isard and Sherwood (1964) which indicated that when certain client expectations were not realized, satisfaction with the counseling experience decreased.

The importance of the counselor comfort dimension in this study may help explain the well-substantiated observation that more experienced counselors are, in general, more effective and successful (Bergin, 1966). As previously pointed out, CEI ratings have been found to be related to level of experience (Ivey, Miller, & Gabbert, 1968; Reed, 1969). It would appear that experience per se, while associated with counseling success, is not causally related to counselor effectiveness. A more tenable conclusion would be that counseling success varies as a function of counselor comfort, and that counselors tend to become more comfortable with experience. Consequently, experienced counselors would tend to be more effective to the extent that their experience is accompanied by perceived comfort with their involvement in a particular counseling context -- in this case, a group counseling service designed to effect academic recovery.

References

Bednar, R. L., & Weinberg, S.L. Ingredients of successful treatment programs for underachievers. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 1-7.

Bergin, A.E. Some implications of psychotherapy research for therapeutic practice. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1966, 71, 235-246.

Brown, D., & Cannaday, M. Counselor, counselee, and supervisor ratings of counselor effectiveness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1969, 8, 113-118.

Gilbreath, S.H. Group counseling and male underachieving college volunteers. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1967, 45, 469-476.

Isard, E.S., & Sherwood, E.J. Counselor behavior and counselee expectations as related to satisfactions with counseling interview. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1964, 42, 920-921.

Ivey, A.E., Miller, C.D., & Gabbert, K.H. Counselor assignment and client attitude: A systematic replication. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 194-195.

Johnson, D., Shertzer, B., Linden, J.E., & Stone, S.C. Relationship of counselor candidate characteristics and counseling effectiveness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 6, 297-304.

Linden, J.D., Stone, S.C., & Shertzer, B. Development and evaluation of an inventory for rating counseling. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1965, 44, 267-276.

Reed, M. A study of client satisfaction as a criterion to evaluate effective counseling. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Utah, 1969.

Rickabaugh, K., Heaps, R.A., & Fuhriman, A. Relationship between counseling outcome and client perceptions of Efficient Study Program counselors. Research Report No. 21. University of Utah Counseling Center, 1969.

Rickabaugh, K., & Pappas, J.P. The academic recovery of probationary students: An exploratory study. Utah Personnel and Guidance Department Research Bulletin, 1969, 2, 25-29.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

COUNSELING EVALUATION INVENTORY

S. C. Stone, J. D. Linden and B. Shertzer
Purdue University

Instructions

On the following page are some statements about counseling. Your task is to rate your own counseling experience using these statements. Next to each statement are five boxes. Helping words have been placed above the boxes to tell you what each box means.

For example, one student rated these sample statements in the following way:

	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
A. The counselor had a good sense of humor.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
B. The counselor did not listen to what I said.	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

The person who judged statement "A" thought that his counselor often had a good sense of humor. He marked statement "B" to indicate that his counselor rarely failed to listen to what he had to say.

You are to rate all of the statements on the following page by placing an X in the box which best expresses how you feel about your own counseling experience.

Here are some suggestions which may be of help to you:

1. This is <u>not</u> a test. The best answer is the one which <u>honestly</u> describes your own counseling experience.

2. Be sure to answer <u>all</u> the items.

3. Do <u>not</u> mark more than one box for any one item.

4. There is no time limit; however, work rapidly. Do not spend too much time on any one item.

To begin, turn this page over

Your Name: _____ Sex: _____

Date: _____

DO NOT WRITE HERE

	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	
1. I felt the counselor accepted me as an individual.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	1. ___
2. I felt comfortable in my interviews with the counselor.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	2. ___
3. The counselor acted as though he thought my concerns and problems were important to him.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	3. ___
4. The counselor acted uncertain of himself.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	4. ___
5. The counselor helped me to see how taking tests would be helpful to me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	5. ___
6. The counselor acted cold and distant.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	6. ___
7. I felt at ease with the counselor.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	7. ___
	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	8. ___
8. The counselor seemed restless while talking to me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	9. ___
9. In our talks, the counselor acted as if he were better than I.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	10. ___
10. The counselor's comments helped me to see more clearly what I need to do to gain my objectives in life.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	11. ___
11. I believe the counselor had a genuine desire to be of service to me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	12. ___
12. The counselor was awkward in starting our interviews.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	13. ___
13. I felt satisfied as a result of my talks with the counselor.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	14. ___
14. The counselor was very patient.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	15. ___
	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	16. ___
15. Other students could be helped by talking with counselors.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	17. ___
16. In opening our conversations, the counselor was relaxed and at ease.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	18. ___
17. I distrusted the counselor.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	19. ___
18. The counselor's discussion of test results was helpful to me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	20. ___
19. The counselor insisted on being always right.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	21. ___
20. The counselor gave the impression of "feeling at ease."	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	22. ___
21. The counselor acted as if he had a job to do and didn't care how he accomplished it.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	23. ___
						24. ___
						25. ___
						26. ___
						27. ___
						28. ___
						29. ___
						30. ___

DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE

Co: _____ C# _____ CS: _____

APPENDIX B

Counseling Evaluation Inventory (CEI) Means and Standard Deviations for Six Counselors

CEI SUBTEST		Counselor A (N=6)	B (N=8)	C (N=9)	D (N=9)	E (N=7)	F (N=23)
Counseling Climate	MEAN	12.20	15.50	13.11	9.40	13.71	13.18
	SD	3.12	2.50	4.56	3.27	3.91	3.85
Client Satisfaction	MEAN	6.40	9.13	7.89	6.67	9.57	8.32
	SD	4.08	1.96	3.14	2.83	2.97	3.06
Counselor Comfort	MEAN	3.40	6.13	6.22	5.22	7.71	8.46
	SD	4.05	3.06	3.39	2.74	3.10	3.27
Total Score	MEAN	22.00	30.75	27.22	21.33	31.00	29.96
	SD	10.53	5.63	9.27	7.02	8.33	7.39